

1 **REMARKS**

2 Herein, the "Action" or "Office Action" refers to the Office Action dated
3 June 5, 2003.

4 Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the
5 claims of the application. Claims 1-13, 23, 24, 35, and 39-56 are presently
6 pending. Claims amended herein are 12, 35, 39, 40, 42, 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54,
7 55, and 56 . No claims are cancelled herein. No new claims are added herein.

8 The Applicant expressly grants permission to the Office to interpret all
9 pending claims of this application.

10
11 **Prior Art Status of References**

12 Applicant does not explicitly or implicitly admit that any reference is prior
13 art. Nothing in this communication should be considered an acknowledgement,
14 acceptance, or admission that any reference is considered prior art.
15

16 **The § 101 Rejections**

17 **Claims 39 and 40** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to
18 non-statutory subject matter.
19

20 The Patent Office has provided an "Examination Guideline for Computer-
21 Related Inventions" which is particularly instructive in considering the above
22 claim rejections. In this guideline, the Office discusses non-statutory subject
23 matter as such relates to computer-related inventions. Specifically, the Office
24 describes two types of descriptive material—functional and non-functional.
25

1 Functional descriptive material consists of data structures and computer
2 programs which impart functionality when encoded on a computer-readable
3 medium. Such data structures and programs are statutory when embodied on a
4 computer-readable medium. Applicant amends these claims to clarify that the data
5 structures do, in fact, reside on computer-readable media.

6 Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are in proper
7 format and are allowable as indicated above.

8
9 **The § 102 Claim Rejections**

10 Claims 23, 44, 46, 47, 50, 53, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §
11 102(e). Applicant traverses these rejections and asks that they be withdrawn and
12 the case passed along to issuance.

13 The Office's rejections are based upon the following reference:

14 **Griffin:** *Griffin et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,442,714.

15 Applicant expressly reserves the right to file a § 131 declaration with
16 respect to Griffin.

17
18 **The § 103 Claim Rejections**

19 Claims 1-13, 24, 35, 41-43, 45, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54, and 56 stand rejected
20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant traverses these rejections and asks that they
21 be withdrawn and the case passed along to issuance.

22 The Office's rejections are based upon the following references:

23 **Griffin;** and

24 **Smith,** *Jody K. Smith*, U.S. Patent No. 6,018,748.
25

1 Applicant expressly reserves the right to file a § 131 declaration with
2 respect to Smith.

3
4 **Claims 1-7**

5 **Claim 1** recites a spider-friendly Web page generation method comprising
6 [emphasis added]:

- 7
- generating an instance of a main Web page having at least one link
8 with a dynamic address pointing to a dynamic Web page; and
 - *converting the dynamic address into a static address* that also
9 points to the dynamic Web page.

10 In making out the rejection of claim 1, the Office argues that the recited act
11 of “*converting the dynamic address into a static address* that also points to the
12 dynamic Web page” is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 35-42, and column
13 5, lines 25-45.

14 As described by Griffin in col. 5, lines 30-43, Griffin takes the information
15 after the “?” in a URL and converts it to a series of command-line parameters and
16 passes them to a Perl script. Applicant submits this is quite different than
17 *converting a dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a static*
18 *address* that also points to the dynamic Web page.

19 Griffin passes input parameters to a script that performs some acts. It
20 appears that these acts may include loading a dynamic Web page. Applicant
21 submits that this behavior is consistent with what Applicant describes on page 2
22 and 3 of the Background section of the present application. Griffin does not
23 appear to convert the address from one form into another form.
24
25

1 Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no disclosure or
2 suggestion in Griffin to convert addresses.

3 If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the
4 Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses a *static address* that
5 points to a *dynamic web page*.

6 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose
7 the feature of converting a static address to a dynamic address, Applicant
8 respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicant asks the
9 Office to withdraw its rejection.

10 **Claims 2-7** depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an
11 allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
12 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed
13 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
14 another. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejections.

15
16 **Claims 8-13**

17 **Claim 8** recites a static to dynamic (S-to-D) Web address conversion
18 method comprising [emphasis added]:

- 19
- 20 • receiving a request for a dynamic Web page, the request including a
static address pointing to the dynamic Web page; and
 - 21 • *converting the static address to a dynamic address* also pointing to
the dynamic Web page.

22 In making out the rejection of claim 8, the Office argues that the recited act
23 of "*converting the static address to a dynamic address* also pointing to the
24 dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 5, lines 5-45.
25

1 As described by Griffin in col. 5, lines 30-43, Griffin takes the information
2 after the “?” in a URL and converts it to a series of command-line parameters and
3 passes them to a Perl script. Applicant submits this is quite different than
4 *converting the static address to a dynamic address that* also points to the dynamic
5 Web page. Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no disclosure or
6 suggestion in Griffin to convert addresses.

7 If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the
8 Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses a conversion of a
9 static address to a dynamic address.

10 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner’s own admission, Smith, disclose
11 the feature of conversion of a static address to a dynamic address. Accordingly,
12 Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

13 **Claims 9-13** depend from claim 8 and are allowable as depending from an
14 allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited
15 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 8, are neither disclosed
16 nor suggested by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
17 another. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejections.

18
19 **Claims 23-24**

20 **Claim 23** recites a dynamic to static (D-to-S) Web address conversion
21 method comprising [emphasis added]:

- 22
- receiving a dynamic address pointing to a dynamic Web page; and
 - 23 • *converting the dynamic address to a static address* also pointing to
24 the dynamic Web page.
- 25

1 In making out the rejection of claim 23, the Office argues that the recited
2 act of "*converting the dynamic address to a static address* also pointing to the
3 dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 22-64.

4 Applicant submits that Griffin's behavior (as disclosed at column 3, lines
5 22-64) is consistent with the conventional addressing and generating of dynamic
6 Web pages (as described on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of the present
7 application). Griffin does not appear to convert the address from one form into
8 another form.

9 Applicant submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest
10 address conversion. If Griffin does, Applicant is unable to locate the specific text
11 that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office
12 specifically point out any such text.

13 Applicant respectfully submits that Griffin does not disclose *converting a*
14 *dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *to a static address* also pointing
15 to the dynamic Web page.

16 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose
17 the feature of *converting a dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *to a*
18 *static address* also pointing to the dynamic Web page. Accordingly, Applicant
19 asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

20 **Claim 24** depends from claim 23 and is allowable as depending from an
21 allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features
22 which, in combination with those recited in claim 23, are neither disclosed nor
23 suggested by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
24 another. Additionally, given the allowability of claim 23, the addition of the
25

1 Smith reference in the rejection of claim 24 is not seen to add anything of
2 significance. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

3
4 **Claim 35**

5 **Claim 35** recites a method of providing a dynamic Web page comprising
6 [emphasis added]:

- 7
- 8 • *receiving a request for a dynamic Web page* from a computer on a
9 network, the request including a *static Web address pointing to the*
10 *dynamic Web page*;
 - 11 • generating an instance of the dynamic Web page such that contents
12 of the instance appears as a static Web page; and
 - 13 • sending the dynamic Web page to the computer.

14 In making out the rejection of claim 35, the Office argues that the recited
15 act of “*receiving a request for a dynamic Web page* from a computer on a
16 network, the request including a *static Web address pointing to the dynamic Web*
17 *page*” is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 22-64, and column 4, lines 5-30.

18 Applicant submits that Griffin’s behavior (as disclosed by the cited excerpts
19 of Griffin) is consistent with the conventional addressing and generating of
20 dynamic Web pages (as described on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of
21 the present application). As is conventional, Applicant submits that requests for
22 dynamic Web pages received by Griffin include a dynamic address (and not a
23 static one).

24 Applicant submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest a
25 static Web address pointing to a dynamic Web page. If Griffin does, Applicant is
unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully
requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

1 Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose “*receiving a request for a*
2 *dynamic Web page . . . the request including a static Web address pointing to the*
3 *dynamic Web page.*”

4 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner’s own admission, Smith, disclose
5 the feature of “*receiving a request for a dynamic Web page . . . the request*
6 *including a static Web address pointing to the dynamic Web page.*” Accordingly,
7 Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

8
9 **Claim 41**

10 **Claim 41** recites a Web site system comprising [emphasis added]:

- 11
- 12 • a Web server hosting a dynamic Web site;
 - 13 • a database storing data used by the Web server to generate dynamic
14 Web pages of the dynamic Web site, the Web server being
15 operatively coupled to the Web server; and
 - 16 • a static to dynamic (S-to-D) Web address converter, the converter
17 being operatively coupled to the Web server;
 - 18 • the S-to-D Web address converter being configured to *convert a*
19 *static address to a dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web
20 page.

21 In making out the rejection of claim 41, the Office argues that the recited
22 “S-to-D Web address converter being configured to *convert a static address to a*
23 *dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web page” is disclosed by Griffin in
24 column 3, lines 35-42, and column 5, lines 25-45.

25 Applicant submits that Griffin’s behavior (as disclosed by the cited excerpts
of Griffin) is consistent with the conventional addressing and generating of
dynamic Web pages (as described on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of
the present application).

1 Applicant submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest
2 address conversion. If Griffin does, Applicant is unable to locate the specific text
3 that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office
4 specifically point out any such text.

5 Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose *converting a static address*
6 *to a dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web page.

7 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose
8 the feature of *converting a static address to a dynamic address* pointing to a
9 dynamic Web page. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its
10 rejection.

11
12 **Claim 42**

13 **Claim 42** recites a Web site system comprising [emphasis added]:

- 14 • a Web server hosting a dynamic Web site;
- 15 • a database storing data used by the Web server to generate dynamic
16 Web pages of the dynamic Web site, the database being operatively
17 coupled to the Web server; and
- 18 • a dynamic to static (D-to-S) Web address converter, the converter
19 being operatively coupled to the Web server;
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

- the D-to-S Web address converter being configured to *convert a dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a static address* also pointing to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 42, the Office argues that the recited “D-to-S Web address converter being configured to *convert a dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a static address* also pointing to the dynamic Web page” is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 35-42, and column 5, lines 25-45.

Applicant submits that Griffin’s behavior (as disclosed by the cited excerpts of Griffin) is consistent with the conventional addressing and generating of dynamic Web pages (as described on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of the present application).

Applicant submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest address conversion. If Griffin does, Applicant is unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose *converting a dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a static address also* pointing to the dynamic Web page.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner’s own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of *converting a dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a static address also* pointing to the dynamic Web page. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 43

1 **Claim 43** recites a server comprising [emphasis added]:

- 2
- 3 • a processor;
 - 4 • a request receiver executable on the processor to receive a request including a static address of a main Web page;
 - 5 • a spider-friendly Web page generator executable on the processor to:
 - 6 ○ *receive the static address* of the main Web page from the request receiver;
 - 7 ○ generate an instance of the main Web page having at least one link with an address pointing to a dynamic Web page.
- 8

9 In making out the rejection of claim 43, the Office argues that the recited
10 “spider-friendly Web page generator executable on the processor to: *receive the*
11 *static address* of the main Web page from the request receiver” is disclosed by
12 Griffin in column 3, lines 22-64, and column 5, lines 20-46.

13 Applicant submits that Griffin’s behavior (as disclosed by the cited excerpts
14 of Griffin) is consistent with the conventional addressing and generating of
15 dynamic Web pages (as described on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of
16 the present application). Applicant submits that Griffin is silent on what it would
17 do if it received a static address rather than a dynamic one.

18 Applicant submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest a
19 spider-friendly Web page generator executable on a processor to: *receive the static*
20 *address* of the main Web page from the request receiver. If Griffin does, Applicant
21 is unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully
22 requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

23 Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose a spider-friendly Web page
24 generator executable on a processor to: *receive the static address* of the main Web
25 page from the request receiver.

1 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose
2 the feature of a spider-friendly Web page generator executable on a processor to:
3 *receive the static address* of the main Web page from the request receiver.
4 Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

5
6 **Claim 44**

7 **Claim 44** recites a server comprising [emphasis added]:

- 8 • a processor;
- 9 • a static to dynamic (S-to-D) Web address converter executable on
10 the processor to:
 - *convert a static address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into*
11 *a dynamic address* that also points to the dynamic Web page.

12 In making out the rejection of claim 44, the Office argues that the recited
13 "S-to-D Web address converter executable on the processor to: *convert a static*
14 *address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a dynamic address* that also points
15 to the dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 35-42, and
16 column 5, lines 25-45.

17 As described by Griffin in col. 5, lines 30-43, Griffin takes the information
18 after the "?" in a URL and converts it to a series of command-line parameters and
19 passes them to a Perl script. Applicant submits this is quite different than
20 *converting a static address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a dynamic*
21 *address* that also points to the dynamic Web page.

22 Griffin passes input parameters to a script that performs some acts. It
23 appears that these acts may include loading a dynamic Web page. Applicant
24 submits that this behavior is consistent with what Applicant describes on page 2
25

1 and 3 of the Background section of the present application. Griffin does not
2 appear to convert the address from one form into another form.

3 Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no disclosure or
4 suggestion in Griffin to convert addresses.

5 If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the
6 Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses a *static address* that
7 points to a *dynamic web page*.

8 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose
9 the feature of a *static address* that points to a *dynamic web page*. Accordingly,
10 Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

11
12 **Claim 45**

13 **Claim 45** recites a server comprising [emphasis added]:

- 14
- a processor;
 - a static to dynamic (S-to-D) Web address converter executable on
15 the processor to:
 - *parse a static address* to identify at least one value associated
16 with a field within the static address; and
 - generating a dynamic address incorporating at least one value
17 associated with the field, wherein the dynamic address points
18 to the dynamic Web page.

19 In making out the rejection of claim 45, the Office argues that the recited
20 “S-D Web address converter executable on the processor to: *parse a static address*
21 to identify at least one value associated with a field within the static address” is
22 disclosed by Griffin in column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 11. A portion of that
23 cited excerpt is set forth below [emphasis added]:
24
25

1 When a user fills in the requested job information and sends a
2 request to the web server, the test application server receives
3 the filled-in web form *data values*, parses the *data values*,
4 and checks mandatory fields of the form for missing or
5 obviously erroneous data.

6 Griffin parses *data values* from a filled-in web form. Furthermore, Griffin
7 appears to parse the parameters of the dynamic address (like that in col. 5, lines
8 30-43) in generating a dynamic Web page.

9 Applicant submits that neither action involves parsing of a *static address*.
10 Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no disclosure or suggestion
11 in Griffin to parse static addresses.

12 If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the
13 Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses generating a *dynamic*
14 *address* incorporating at least one value associated with a field parsed from a
15 *static address*.

16 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose
17 the feature of generating a *dynamic address* incorporating at least one value
18 associated with a field parsed from a *static address*. Accordingly, Applicant asks
19 the Office to withdraw its rejection.

20 Claim 46

21 **Claim 46** recites a server comprising [emphasis added]:

- 22 • a processor;
- 23 • a dynamic to static (D-to-S) Web address converter executable on
24 the processor to:
 - 25 ○ *convert a dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web page
into a *static address* also pointing to the dynamic Web page.

1 In making out the rejection of claim 46, the Office argues that the recited
2 “D-to-S Web address converter executable on the processor to: *convert a dynamic*
3 *address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a static address* also pointing to the
4 dynamic Web page” is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 22-64.

5 Applicant submits that Griffin’s behavior (as disclosed by the cited excerpts
6 of Griffin) is consistent with the conventional addressing and generating of
7 dynamic Web pages (as described on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of
8 the present application).

9 Applicant submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest
10 *converting a dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a static*
11 *address* also pointing to the dynamic Web page. If Griffin does, Applicant is
12 unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully
13 requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

14 If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the
15 Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses a *static address* that
16 points to a *dynamic web page*.

17 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner’s own admission, Smith, disclose
18 the feature of a *static address* that points to a *dynamic web page*. Accordingly,
19 Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

20
21 **Claim 47**

22 **Claim 47** recites a system for hosting dynamic Web sites comprising
23 [emphasis added]:

- 24 • a Web server for dynamically generating an instance of a dynamic
25 Web page; and

- a spider-friendly Web page generator configured to:
 - generate an instance of a main Web page having at least one link with a dynamic address pointing to a dynamic Web page; and
 - *convert the dynamic address into a static address* that also points to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 47, the Office argues that the recited “spider-friendly Web page generator configured to: *convert the dynamic address into a static address* that also points to the dynamic Web page” is disclosed by Griffin in column 5, lines 22-64.

Applicant submits that Griffin’s behavior (as disclosed by the cited excerpts of Griffin) is consistent with the conventional addressing and generating of dynamic Web pages (as described on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of the present application).

Applicant submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest *converting a dynamic address into a static address* that also points to the dynamic Web page. If Griffin does, Applicant is unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose *converting a dynamic address into a static address* that also points to the dynamic Web page.

If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses a *static address* that points to a *dynamic web page*.

1 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose
2 the feature of a *static address* that points to a *dynamic web page*. Accordingly,
3 Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

4
5 **Claims 48-49**

6 **Claim 48** recites a system for hosting dynamic Web sites comprising
7 [emphasis added]:

- 8
- 9 • a Web server for dynamically generating an instance of a dynamic
10 Web page in response to a request; and
 - 11 • a static to dynamic (S-to-D) Web address converter;
 - 12 • the Web server being configured to send a Web address of the
13 request to the converter;
 - 14 • the converter being configured to:
 - 15 ○ receive the Web address of the request;
 - 16 ○ determine if the Web address is a static address; and
 - 17 ○ *convert the static address to a dynamic address* that also
18 points to the dynamic Web page.

19 In making out the rejection of claim 48, the Office does not cite any portion
20 of Griffin or Smith that discloses or suggests the recited converter being
21 configured to: "*convert the static address to a dynamic address* that also points to
22 the dynamic Web page."

23 As described by Griffin in col. 5, lines 30-43, Griffin takes the information
24 after the "?" in a URL and converts it to a series of command-line parameters and
25 passes them to a Perl script. Applicant submits this is quite different than
26 *converting a static address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a dynamic*
27 *address* that also points to the dynamic Web page.

28 Griffin passes input parameters to a script that performs some acts. It
29 appears that these acts may include loading a dynamic Web page. Applicant

1 submits that this behavior is consistent with what Applicant describes on page 2
2 and 3 of the Background section of the present application. Griffin does not
3 appear to convert the address from one form into another form.

4 Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no disclosure or
5 suggestion in Griffin to convert addresses.

6 If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the
7 Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses *converting a static*
8 *address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a dynamic address* that also points
9 to the dynamic Web page.

10 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose
11 the feature of *converting a static address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a*
12 *dynamic address* that also points to the dynamic Web page. Accordingly,
13 Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

14 **Claim 49** depends from claim 48 and is allowable as depending from an
15 allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features
16 which, in combination with those recited in claim 48, are neither disclosed nor
17 suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one
18 another. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

19
20 **Claims 50-51**

21 **Claim 50** recites a system for hosting dynamic Web sites comprising
22 [emphasis added]:

- 23
- 24 • a Web server for dynamically generating an instance of a dynamic
25 Web page; and
 - a dynamic-to-static (D-to-S) Web address converter being
configured to:

- *convert a dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a static address* that also points to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 50, the Office argues that the recited “D-to-S Web address converter being configured to: *convert a dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a static address* that also points to the dynamic Web page” is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 35-42, and column 5, lines 25-45.

Applicant again submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest address conversion. If Griffin does, Applicant is unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose *converting a dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a static address* that also points to the dynamic Web page.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner’s own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of *converting a dynamic address* pointing to a dynamic Web page *into a static address* that also points to the dynamic Web page. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 51 depends from claim 50 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 50, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. Additionally, given the allowability of claim 50, the addition of the Smith

1 reference in the rejection of claim 51 is not seen to add anything of significance.

2 Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

3
4 **Claim 52**

5 **Claim 52** recites a computer-readable storage medium having computer-
6 executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs a spider-
7 friendly Web page generation method comprising [emphasis added]:

- 8
- 9 • generating an instance of a spider-friendly Web page having at least
one link with a dynamic address pointing to a dynamic Web page;
and
 - 10 • *converting the dynamic address into a static address* that also
points to the dynamic Web page.
- 11

12 In making out the rejection of claim 52, the Office argues that the recited
13 act of “*converting the dynamic address into a static address* that also points to the
14 dynamic Web page” is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 22-63.

15 Applicant again submits that Griffin (including this cited excerpt) does not
16 appear to disclose or suggest address conversion. If Griffin does, Applicant is
17 unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully
18 requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

19 Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose *converting a dynamic*
20 *address into a static address* that also points to the dynamic Web page.

21 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner’s own admission, Smith, disclose
22 the feature of *converting a dynamic address into a static address* that also points
23 to the dynamic Web page. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its
24 rejection.

25

1 **Claim 53**

2 **Claim 53** recites a computer-readable storage medium having computer-
3 executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs a static to
4 dynamic (S-to-D) Web address conversion method comprising [emphasis added]:

- 5 • receiving a request for a dynamic Web page, wherein the request
6 includes a static address pointing to the dynamic Web page; and
7 • *converting the static address to a dynamic address* that also points
to the dynamic Web page.

8 In making out the rejection of claim 53, the Office argues that the recited
9 act of “*converting the static address to a dynamic address* that also points to the
10 dynamic Web page” is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 22-63, and column
11 5, lines 20-45.

12 As described by Griffin in col. 5, lines 30-43, Griffin takes the information
13 after the “?” in a URL and converts it to a series of command-line parameters and
14 passes them to a Perl script. Applicant submits this is quite different than
15 *converting a static address to a dynamic address* that also points to the dynamic
16 Web page.

17 Griffin passes input parameters to a script that performs some acts. It
18 appears that these acts may include loading a dynamic Web page. Applicant
19 submits that this behavior is consistent with what Applicant describes on page 2
20 and 3 of the Background section of the present application. Griffin does not
21 appear to convert the address from one form into another form.

22 Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no disclosure or
23 suggestion in Griffin to convert addresses.
24
25

1 If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the
2 Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses *converting a static*
3 *address to a dynamic address*.

4 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose
5 the feature of *converting a static address to a dynamic address*. Accordingly,
6 Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

7
8 **Claim 54**

9 **Claim 54** recites a computer-readable storage medium having computer-
10 executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs a static to
11 dynamic (S-to-D) Web address conversion method comprising [emphasis added]:

- 12
- 13 • receiving a static address pointing to a dynamic Web page;
 - 14 • *parsing the static address* to identify at least one value associated
15 with a field within the static address; and
 - 16 • generating a dynamic address incorporating at least one value
17 associated with the field, wherein the dynamic address points to the
18 dynamic Web page.

19 In making out the rejection of claim 54, the Office argues that the recited
20 act of *parsing the static address* to identify at least one value associated with a
21 field within the static address is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, line 64, to
22 column 4, line 12.

23 Griffin parses *data values* from a filled-in web form. Furthermore, Griffin
24 appears to parse the parameters of the dynamic address (like that in col. 5, lines
25 30-43).

1 Applicant submits that neither action involves parsing of a *static address*.
2 Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no disclosure or suggestion
3 in Griffin to parse static addresses.

4 If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the
5 Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses generating a *dynamic*
6 *address* incorporating at least one value associated with a field parsed from a
7 *static address*.

8 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose
9 the feature of generating a *dynamic address* incorporating at least one value
10 associated with a field parsed from a *static address*. Accordingly, Applicant asks
11 the Office to withdraw its rejection.

12
13 **Claim 55**

14 **Claim 55** recites a computer-readable storage medium having computer-
15 executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs a dynamic to
16 static (D-to-S) Web address conversion method comprising [emphasis added]:

- 17
- receiving a dynamic address pointing to a dynamic Web page; and
 - *converting the dynamic address to a static address* that also points
18 to the dynamic Web page.

19 In making out the rejection of claim 55, the Office argues that the recited
20 act of "*converting the dynamic address to a static address* that also points to the
21 dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 5, lines 20-45..

22 Applicant again submits that Griffin (including this cited excerpt) does not
23 appear to disclose or suggest address conversion. If Griffin does, Applicant is
24
25

1 unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully
2 requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

3 Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose *converting a dynamic*
4 *address into a static address* that also points to the dynamic Web page.

5 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose
6 the feature of *converting a dynamic address into a static address* that also points
7 to the dynamic Web page. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its
8 rejection.

10 Claim 56

11 **Claim 56** recites a computer-readable storage medium of claim 55 the
12 instructions for performing converting comprising [emphasis added]:

- 13 • parsing the dynamic address to identify and separate fields within
14 the dynamic address, wherein at least one field has a value; and
- 15 • *generating the static address* incorporating the value of at least one
field, wherein the static address points to the dynamic Web page.

16 In making out the rejection of claim 56, the Office argues that the recited
17 act of "*generating the static address* incorporating the value of at least one field,
18 wherein the static address points to the dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin
19 in column 3, line 64, to column 4, line 12.

20 Griffin parses *data values* from a filled-in web form. Furthermore, Griffin
21 appears to parse the parameters of the dynamic address (like that in col. 5, lines
22 30-43).

23 Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose generation of a *static*
24 *address* that incorporates the value associated with at least one field parsed from a
25

1 *dynamic address*. Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no
2 disclosure or suggestion in Griffin to generate a *static address* in this manner.

3 If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the
4 Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses generation of a *static*
5 *address* that incorporates the value associated with at least one field parsed from a
6 *dynamic address*.

7 As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose
8 the feature of generation of a *static address* that incorporates the value associated
9 with at least one field parsed from a *dynamic address*. Accordingly, Applicant
10 asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

11 12 Claim Amendments

13 Applicant amends claims 12, 35, 39, 40, 42, 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55,
14 and 56 for grammatical purposes only and not for any statutory reason.

1 **Conclusion**

2 All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully
3 requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues
4 remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Office is urged to contact the
5 undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.
6
7

8 Respectfully Submitted,

9
10 Dated: 9-4-03

By: 

Kasey C. Christie
Reg. No. 40559
(509) 324-9256 x232
kasey@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com